

## LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Dear **CROSSTALK** Editor,

In the December 2005 issue, the article “Agile Software Development for the Entire Project” by Granville Miller, Microsoft, describes how the agile process in MSF can make the *agile* described in the Agile Manifesto <[www.agilemanifesto.org](http://www.agilemanifesto.org)> much easier to implement without all of those difficult changes that many others have experienced. He describes how these reflect the fine engineering practices at Microsoft that have led the MSF version of agile to already be a year late.

It has taken more than 20 years for parts of the American manufacturing industry to adopt lean thinking. Agile, which has many parallels to lean manufacturing, will also take a lot of effort and time. Change is always an effort, and only the dramatic benefits of agile make it worthwhile. Efforts by people like Granville Miller to water down agile by redefining the intent

do not help. Efforts that add more process miss the point; process is defined by self-managing teams within frameworks. Decisions are made by these teams working closely with customers to maximize benefit and optimize results.

At the start of the agile movement, we were warned that the larger commercial interests would attempt to water it down to *fit* their existing tools. We should expect to see other similar fits such as from IBM (through RUP in the Eclipse Foundation) and others. The *refinements* suggested by Granville Miller do a disservice to everyone working on agile.

Ken Schwaber  
*Signatory to the Agile Manifesto*  
*Founder of the Agile Alliance*  
*Co-Author of the Scrum Agile process*  
[ken.schwaber@controlchaos.com](mailto:ken.schwaber@controlchaos.com)